

Vol. 14 No 7 July 1989

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
 by Dr J. Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, Tel. 051-794-2455
 RATES for 1989, 10 issues (not August and September)
 SURFACE £9.50 UK, £10.50 Europe, \$(US)18.50 elsewhere
 AIR £10 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.

CONTENTS of which the authors retain the copyright.
 The editor retains copyright in the format



D.B. Campbell (Glasgow): A Note on <i>Ballistaria</i>	98-100
C. Collard (Swansea): <i>Menander</i> , Samia 96-115 <i>Sandbach</i>	101-102
Douglas E. Gerber (Western Ontario): <i>An Epithet in Bacchylides' Dithyramb 16</i>	102-103
J.A.S. Evans (Pretoria): <i>The Consular Candidacy of C. Billienus</i>	103-104
P.G. Naiditch (Dept. Special Collections, Research Library, Augustan Manetho University of California, Los Angeles)	104-106
N. Postlethwaite (Leicester): μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν: <i>Odyssey 11. 478</i>	106-108
Review: F. W. Walbank (Peterhouse, Cambridge)	108-112
Ramsay MacMullen, <i>Corruption and the Decline of Rome</i> , New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1988. Pp.xii + 319; 14 figs.. Cloth, \$18.95. ISBN 0-300-04313-9	

This has been a bad year for Classical Scholarship both in this country and in the United States. The Editor's absence meant that he did not register either the death of Eugene Vanderpool or that of Ben Meritt, the latter on the 7th July aged 90: an obituary in the *Independent* by David Lewis did not appear until the 14th and the Editor has only recently seen it. He had met Meritt during a visit to the University of Pennsylvania (where he freed M.H. Jameson to discover the Themistocles inscription) and can bear witness to the fact that, as Lewis says, 'In a sense, he had never ceased to be a Southerner': a comment on the registration of his car in a Southern State provoked the explanation, perhaps humorously intended, that it was to avoid having a Northern registration stoned when he drove in the South, and he believes, though he cannot vouch for this, that an interest in railways as well as in P.G. Woodhouse consoled his old age.

Then today, September 4th, the world of learning is diminished by the death, after a happily short illness, of Sir Ronald Syme, aged 86, in the jubilee year of the publication of his *Roman Revolution*. The Editor is personally saddened by the news, for he owed a lot to Sir Ronald ever since he returned from the War to read Greats and was 'farmed out' to him, as one Orielman to another, for Roman history tutorials: he well recalls Sir Ronald playing with a dagger paper-knife and asking him how many unattached women he thought there were at the court of Tiberius, a question which, alas, he could not answer, and on another occasion commenting from personal experience on the quality of the cornel trees in Asia Minor. He also, of course, attended his lectures 'Introduction to Period 3' ('Yes, I have heard Syme pray over that'), from which what remains in the mind was his listing of extra-constitutional sources of power. We thought then that while Last admired Mussolini because he thought he was like Augustus, Syme disapproved of Augustus because he thought he was like Hitler.

Later, in 1948, Hugh Last indicated his willingness to accept the Editor as a doctoral pupil, but while approving his choice of subject, the Greek opposition to Rome, its intellectual and ideological basis ('a good subject'), with reservations ('*Kulturgeschichte* is for an older man'), warned him that if he persisted he would have to seek another supervisor. Then it was Sir

Ronald, when consulted, who left him with the strong impression that anybody who did not take the opportunity of supervision by the then Camden Professor on his terms and on a subject of his choosing, would be a fool. This was generous advice in the light of the tensions between the two men of which the Editor at the time knew nothing, but which are illuminated by the remark made to a friend whom Sir Ronald intended to invite to dine in Brazenose, but would wait until he knew that the Principal (as Hugh Last had become, freeing the Camden Chair for surely its greatest holder, a Roman historian fit to be ranked with Theodor Mommsen) was dining, 'that the occasion might not lack splendour and terror'.

Later still, in 1950, when the need for employment became apparent, and a lucrative Fellowship at the University of Sydney was advertised, the Editor again consulted Sir Ronald, and walked with him in the University Parks talking of this and that until they reached the bridge over the Cherwell. Only on the return did the conversation turn to Australia, and, although nothing definite was said, he was left with the strong impression that he would have Sir Ronald's support if he applied, which would almost certainly have meant that he would have got it. Liverpool, however, supervened, initiating the chain of events which has led to LCM. But the commentator on Livy still finds Sir Ronald's paper in *Harvard Studies* on an author not as congenial to him as was Tacitus not the least illuminating item in the bibliography.

For Sir Ronald was proud of his New Zealand origins, and his *Colonial Elites* led us to suppose that he may have thought that the New Zealanders might be the salvation of the British Empire, exceptionally predominant as they are in academic life and in the classics. A New Zealand friend who encountered him and congratulated him on the day his Knighthood was announced met the response 'Thank you. So good for our country'.

The Editor dedicates the major portion of the notes in 'this number of LCM' as his own personal tribute to his old tutor and friend. They have taken the form of personal reminiscence also because he has been urged by more than one subscriber himself to publish his own memories of Oxford, and in particular Classics at Oxford, in the 1940s, and to encourage others to submit to him theirs of that and other places and times. Even if unreliable, such anecdotal evidence provides the material to flesh out and to correct the work of historians of scholarship who did not themselves know the subjects of their studies. Suetonius and Aubrey afford valuable precedents.

Which provides him with the context for informing readers that the postponed Greenbank Colloquium on Classical Scholarship in English in the 19th century (for which some shorter title must be devised) is now planned, in good time, for the first week in August or thereabouts, and a first formal notice and call for the offer of additional and preferably short papers will soon be circulated. Meantime those interested may write to Dr Pinsent. For it must be stressed that this Colloquium is sponsored by the Department, and organised for it by the Editor as one of his last actions in his Departmental Hat.



D.B. Campbell (Glasgow): A Note on *Ballistaria*

LCM 14.7 (Jul.1989) 98-100

In the proceedings of the 13th limeskongress, Professor Speidel credits me with the suggestion that there were no ballistaria at the Roman fort of High Rochester¹. Though mistaken, his resumé of my argument gave me pause to reconsider the question of ballistaria as artillery platforms.

The concept of the *ballistarium* has passed into common usage amongst writers on Roman artillery², although the basic evidence has never been reviewed. In particular, the

¹ M.P. Speidel, in *Studien zu den Militanurgrenzen Roms III* (edd. D. Planck & C. Unz, Stuttgart 1986), 657-660, at p. 660 note 27, citing my paper in *Britannia* 15 (1984), 75-84.

² As exemplified by E.W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery Historical Development* (Oxford 1969), 191.

notion of the *ballistarium* as a long, low, resilient platform owes more to the ingenuity of the late Professor Sir Ian Richmond than to any solid statement from antiquity, as will be seen.

The word *ballistarium* seems to be attested only once; it occurs, not in any military engineering manual, but in a play by Plautus, where the word's meaning is none too clear

*itaque hic scelestus est homo leno Lycus,
quoi iam infortuni intenta ballistast probe,
quam ego haud multo post mittam e ballistario.* (Poenulus 200-202)

Throughout the works of Plautus, the technical vocabulary of artillery is used somewhat idiosyncratically, perhaps out of general ignorance, but it is usually argued from his mistaken usage of *ballista* to signify the missile that he will have used *ballistarium* for the engine itself³. That may be so, but it is hardly a sound foundation for speculating on the nature of *ballistaria*.

This would appear to be the only instance of the word in full, but a handful of examples of its abbreviated form may be adduced. First, the well-known pair of inscriptions from High Rochester (RIB 1280-1281) which allude to the construction and repair of some structure or structures, long ago identified as *ballistaria*: thus, *ballist(arium)a sol[o] . . . fe[ci]t* and *ballis(tarium) a solo re[sti]t[ui]t*⁴. Then there are two military papyri to be considered: the first, perhaps a morning report, tentatively dated to the first quarter of the 3rd century, carries the entry [*custo*]diarum bal⁵, which could easily stand for *custodiarum ballistiariorum*; the second, a Domitianic duty roster belonging to one of the Egyptian legions, probably III *Cyrenaica*⁶, lists amongst the fatigues *ballio*, which may be understood as '*ball<istar>io*'. Of course, in none of these instances are we compelled to make a connection with *ballistaria*. Although the epigraphic examples seem most certain, the papyri may be explained otherwise. Indeed, a guard roster of the period AD 235-240 carries an entry which looks very like '*a d balistas*'⁷, suggesting that soldiers were usually assigned to artillery rather than to artillery positions.

Even if the literary sources make no mention of *ballistaria*, there are those which provide information on the siting of artillery. The so-called *liber de munitionibus castrorum* (chapter 58) refers to the provision of artillery in defence of a temporary camp, but the catapults are sited, not on *ballistaria*, but on *tormentis tribunalia*. There is also the oft-quoted passage on the *onager* by Ammianus Marcellinus (23 4.5), in which he recommends that the machine be placed *super congestos caespites vel latericios aggeres*. These two passages, taken together with the identification of an archaeological feature at Cawthorn, are responsible for the definitive description of artillery-platforms: '*ballistaria*, or *tribunalia*, which ancient literature describes as built of turf'⁸. This is patently unsound reasoning. Ammianus does not name his structure as a *ballistarium* (nor even an *onagrinum*, which would surely be more appropriate under the circumstances), nor does he imply that its peculiar construction was necessary for any artillery-piece other than the *onager*, and a large *onager* at that⁹.

So much for *ballistaria*. However, there is a selection of texts mentioning *βελοστάσεις*, the

³ For instance, P. Langen, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus* (Leipzig 1880), 275.

⁴ J. Collingwood Bruce, *Lapidarium Septentrionale* (London 1875), 298-301, where he conjectures that the word *ballistarium* 'no doubt applies to the solid platform on which the *ballistae* and other engines for projecting stones and other missiles were planted' (p. 299).

⁵ *P. Mich.* 455b recto; cf. R.O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (Michigan 1971), 201-203 no. 52c, preferring the expansion '*custodiarum bal(nei)*'.

⁶ *P. Gen. Lat.* I verso, part V; cf. Fink, *op. cit.*, 106-114 no. 9, where *ballio* is taken to be somehow cognate with *balnei*.

⁷ *P. Dur.* 106; cf. Fink, *op. cit.*, 126-127 no. 13.

⁸ I.A. Richmond, *Archaeol. J.* 89 (1932), 17-18, at p. 57; cf. idem, *Archaeol. Aeliana* 13 (1936), 170-198, at p. 181: '[*ballistaria*] may now be pictured as large and relatively low platforms, from which spring-guns fired their missiles with a parabolic trajectory over the heads of defenders on the rampart-walk'.

⁹ Cf. my comments in *Britannia* 15 (1984), 80 note 37.

Greek equivalent. Both Polybius (9.41.8) and Diodorus Siculus (20.85.4) make passing reference to these, but we may hope for something better from Philo Byzantinus, an engineering writer of the later 3rd century B.C.; his *Paraskeuastika*, which leads into the *Poliorketika* and is sometimes subsumed under the same title, gives advice on the siting of artillery-positions:

At the foot of walls and *proteichismata*, for the largest and most numerous artillery-pieces, there are *belostaseis* of which some are at ground level and others underground in order to have plenty of room and so that the crews may not be injured but strike at their adversaries unseen and so that, whenever the enemy approach, the artillerymen do not become useless from inability to lower their sights (*Para.* I 32 = Thévenot 82.6-14)

This is all very interesting, but there is nothing to suggest that the *belostasis* is anything other than a simple artillery emplacement. A second, earlier reference is scarcely more helpful, but is worth quoting for the sake of completeness:

The windows for the firing of catapults and stone-throwers should be in (the walls of) towers in which the *belostaseis* have been built from ground level (*Para.* I 21 = Thévenot 81. 15-18)

Whatever else this passage suggests, it seems to imply that the *belostasis* comprised the entire upper-storey room, solidly underpinned for one reason or another. At any rate, in neither passage are we justified in translating the word as 'artillery platform'.

Perhaps most informative of all is Athenaios mechanicus; his manual of military engineering, apparently written in the late first century B.C., is echoed by Vitruvius, who must have drawn upon the same original source. When Athenaios describes the armament of the monstrous ram-tortoise designed by the Byzantine Hegetor, he writes:

Moreover, it has a middle storey, resting upon the pediment beams, on which the *belostasia* is positioned (W22. 10-12)

However, the parallel passage in Vitruvius' *de architectura* makes no mention of an 'artillery platform' *per se*. Instead, the Roman refers simply to

media contabulatio supra trabiculas, ubi scorpiones et catapultae conlocabantur
(*de arch.* 10.15.4)

This is, after all, exactly what we should expect: the artillery is loaded on to the *testudo*, as onto the *helepolis*, without requiring any special 'artillery platform'¹⁰. When Athenaios speaks of a *belostasia*, he simply means the action station of the artillery; the word has no connotations of structural form, and it is perhaps more suitable to treat it as a collective term for artillery, such as 'battery'. In Philo's case, the *belostasis* is certainly a physical structure, but his usage implies no particular design, so that, far from being an 'artillery platform', it is better rendered 'artillery emplacement', or, again, 'battery'.

The conclusion is clear if not particularly revolutionary. There is no doubt that, in certain situations, catapults required custom-built 'platforms'; where the siting was precarious, for instance (as, presumably, on the ramparts of the camp described in the *liber de munitionibus castrorum*), or where the artillery-piece was liable to do damage without a resilient base (as with Ammianus' *onager*). However, we should not be far wrong in assuming that, in general, the *ballistarium*, like the *belostasis*, was simply the position where artillery was sited. It is a grave mistake to attribute any universality of design or construction to such artillery positions. In the final analysis, the *ballistaria* epigraphically attested at High Rochester were simply the artillery emplacements; we may envisage the adaptation of the towers to accommodate the catapults and protect them from rain and enemy fire.

Copyright © 1989 D.B.Campbell

¹⁰ It is clear from the historical sources that the primary armament of *helepoleis* was artillery, though the technical sources do not elaborate on this aspect.

Demeas and Nikeratos make their first entry; they exclaim their relief at returning to their own dear Athens (96-7, 100-4) from the unpleasant ambience of Pontos and Byzantion (97-100, 106-12) where conducting business has been so disagreeable (99). Joyful greeting to a home-city is a dramatic entry-*topos* (for New Comedy see e.g. H.-D. Blume, *Menanders Samia*, Darmstadt 1974, 36 n. 61), but why does Menander give his two old men 15 or so lines of talk about their travels before they resume an earlier discussion of their plans to marry Demeas' adopted son Moschion to Nikeratos' daughter Plangon (113 ff.; this is the issue of the play, cf. Moschion already at 52-3, 64-7)? In particular, why the strikingly humorous tone of their exchange, even its mild banter at 110-2?

Demeas' opening recollection of 'the bad things over there' (97) is at once defined by Nikeratos: Πόντος· παχέις γέροντες, λιχθὺς ἀφθονοί, δηδία τις πραγμάτων (98-9). The alliteration upon π seems to point up the derogatory catalogue, no less than the staccato delivery, especially effective here, which typifies Nikeratos' speech in the play (Sandbach in A. W. Gomme, F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: a Commentary*, Oxford 1973, on *Sam.* 98-101a). Assonance and staccato continue in his punning denunciation Βυζάντιον· ἀψίνθειον, πικρὰ πάντ', and even the concluding oath Ἄπολλον (99-100). Nikeratos' particular memory of Pontos' extraordinary sunlessness (106-9) prompts Demeas' bantering rejoinder 'the sun saw nothing special to watch in that place, so he only shone the minimum of light upon the people there' (110-11).

Is this pleasantry both the climax and the sole object of the travellers' reminiscences at entry? Nikeratos' first adjective is παχύς, applied to the γέροντες of Pontos (98), and παχύς is his last, applied to the ἀήρ which continuously darkened the sun there; but this play on the senses of παχύς cannot be the reason for the extended exchange. (If one English word must reproduce the one Greek word in both places, either 'thick' or 'dense' seems inescapable. If differing English words are to be used, 'fat' is possible for the 'old men' in 98; it is favoured by Blume [p. 41; see also below], and by Sandbach who allows 'dense, stupid' as well. D. Bain, *Menander: Samia*, Warminster 1983, translates 98 with 'rich', allowing perhaps 'fat' as well; the implied contrast between Pontines and 'poor' Athenians (101) may support the translation 'rich', but with 'rich' the derogatory tone of 98-9 is weakened).

One may expect Menander rather to intend the reminiscences, and their verbal style, to sketch the general characters of the two old men at entry, and to distinguish them helpfully for the audience, since their interaction is to be so important for the play's later development (on this technique see e.g. T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander*, London 1974, 99 f., esp. 104 f. on *Samia*). So Blume, for example, suggests (p. 51) that the exchange establishes the relationship of the old men, Demeas as a jovial old fellow (contradictory to the audience's expectation of him created by Moschion's anxiety at 67: Blume p. 39), who is quicker and readier in wits than the simple and brusque Nikeratos; Sandbach (on 107) notes how 106-11 reveal Nikeratos as giving 'a characteristic down-to-earth explanation' while Demeas' 'fancy' in 110-11 is meant no more seriously than 'the story he later tries to impose upon Nikeratos, that a god was the father of Plangon's child' (589 ff.).

These important first words of Demeas and Nikeratos have a further comic purpose, I think: anticipatory and ironic implication for the old men's intentions. The denouncer of the Pontine παχέις γέροντες is himself a γέρων (if παχέις means primarily 'fat', and the papyrus correctly attributes 98-101 to Demeas, Blume (p. 43) attractively relates the adjective to Demeas' characterization by Nikeratos as ἡδύς 'easy-living, easy-going' at 412, in contrast with Nikeratos whom Demeas describes as τραχύς 'rough', implicitly a man of 'thin' build, at 550; δηδία in 99 would add a further ironic nuance to Demeas' complaint. The irony of παχέις γέροντες is not lost if Nikeratos speaks 98-101, as Sandbach prints them, but Blume's suggestion is a small counter-indication to Sandbach's attribution on the grounds of Nikeratos's typifying staccato). The whole conversation of 96-112 implies a more pleasing

irony still: Demeas and Nikeratos complain of the 'thick' old men of Pontos, whose nature is determined by that of the country they inhabit, its climate dominated by fog, 109. Blume (p.49 n.97) cites Hippocrates, *Airs etc.* 19 for the theory, no doubt popular in origin as much as 'medical', which associated the 'thick build' of the Scythian nomads (*εἶδεα... παχέα*) with the 'thick fog' of their habitat (*ἡὴρ . . . πολὺς, ἡέρα . . . παχύν*): Menander has his old men concertina Scythians and Pontines (Blume might better have cited Hipp. *Airs* 15 for the same association of climate with build in the geographically closer Phasians, and for their naturally greater laziness). The Athens which Demeas and Nikeratos imply enjoys a brilliant and pure light is proved in the play's development to 'shine its sun' (111; at 101 *καθαρά* may anticipate the notion; for the adjective of pure and open sunlight see LSJ 1.2 and 3) on them with the same reluctance as on the befogged Pontines (109): Demeas' efforts in the play, and Nikeratos', are no less dim. Indeed, at 417 Nikeratos attributed Demeas' sudden, inexplicable behaviour directly to the 'unhealthy' Pontos.

The ironic implication of the reminiscences gains from the second, straightforward dramatic irony which follows in 113 ff.; with the old men's determination already to arrange his marriage, the audience can enjoy not only how Moschion will be working without great hope to achieve it, but also how his own and the old men's behaviour will threaten it.

All this said, I have so far found no very close parallel for the metaphorical use of 'fog', despite searching lexica and concordances under such words as *δήρ, δχλύς, νεφέλη, ὁμιχλή, σκότος, caligo, nebula*.

Copyright © 1989 C.Collard

Douglas E. Gerber (Western Ontario): *An Epithet in Bacchylides' Dithyramb 16*

LCM 14.7 (Jul.1989), 102-103

The myth of Heracles, Iole and Deianeira in Dithyramb 16 is related with Bacchylides' usual profusion of epithets. In contrast, however, to most of his poems, it has been recently demonstrated in a splendid article by Laura Simonini that nearly all the epithets in this poem have a special significance¹. In most instances I agree with her explanations, but there is one epithet which I think has been misinterpreted.

The last sentence of the poem (vv. 31-35) refers allusively to the tragic consequences resulting from Deianeira's trust in the gift she received from the dying centaur, a gift which he said would restore Heracles' affection but which instead caused his death:

φθόνος εὐρυβλᾶς νιν ἀπώλεσεν
 δυνόφερὸν τε κάλυμμα τῶν
 ὕστερον ἐρχομένων
 ὅτ' ἐπὶ ροδόεντι Λυκόρμα
 δέξατο Νέσσου πάρα δαιμόνιον τέρας.

My concern is with *ροδόεντι* in v.34. According to Jebb, who compares *ἐπ' ἀνθεμόεντι* "Εβρω in v. 5 and *παρ' ἀνθεμῶ[δεα] Νεῖλον* in 19.39, the epithet is 'purely conventional', and no one, so far as I know, has disagreed with this explanation prior to Simonini. She sees an analogy between *ἐπὶ ροδόεντι Λυκόρμα* and *Οἰχαλλαν πυρὶ δαπτομέναν* in v. 14, with *ροδόεντι* alluding to *πυρὶ*, but Hesychius' gloss of *ροδόεις* with *πυρρά* is hardly sufficient support for such an interpretation. She also sees in the epithet an allusion "*ad un'altra strage: quella di Nesso, il cui sangue imporpora le acque*", and she adds that *ροδόεις* might have the force of *πορφύρεος*, "*un riferimento ai flutti agitati del fiume, particolarmente turbinoso per il dibattersi di Nesso sotto i dardi di Eracle e quindi 'rosato' per il rimuoversi della sabbia sul fondo*". There is, however, no evidence that *ροδόεις* could allude to blood² or that it could have

¹ L. Simonini, 'Il ditirambo XVI di Bacchilide', *Acme* 30 (1977) 485-99.

² Simonini provides no parallels and I know of none. It would clearly be inappropriate to cite passages such

the force of πορφύρεος.

Nevertheless, I think it can be shown that the epithet does have special significance, provided one compares the context in which it is used with the earlier context of the parallel phrase in v. 5 (ἐπ' ἀνθεμόεντι Ἑβρωί). Both passages have a river-name, the same preposition, and a similar adjective, but the contexts are very different. In the earlier passage the setting is joyous, in the latter the setting is one of attempted rape and death. There is thus a grim irony in the choice of the epithet and the irony is heightened by two additional features. The first is the name given to the river. Sophocles calls the river Euenus (*Trach.* 559), but Bacchylides uses its older name, Lycormas, the river that 'rushes like a wolf'. Bacchylides may well have deliberately chosen the older name in order to obtain within the phrase itself a contrast similar to that just mentioned between the two different settings. There is thus something of an oxymoron in the combination ροδόεντι Λυκόρμα, something that is in a way similar to the designation of ἔρως as γλυκύπικρος. This leads to the second feature, the erotic overtones present in the epithet. Not only is the rose Aphrodite's flower *par excellence*, but it is also in flowery surroundings, frequently in the neighbourhood of water, that many girls in mythology are abducted³. The roses on the banks of the Lycormas are therefore an appropriate setting for Nessus' attempted rape. The difference between this and the other examples is that here the rape is unsuccessful and results in death.

Thus, the irony created by ροδόεντι Λυκόρμα contributes to the overall irony of the μῆτιν which the δαίμων wove for Deianeira (vv. 24-25). This was thoughtful (ἐπιφρονα), but it resulted in many tears (πολύδακρυν), since the τέρας she received from Nessus brought about the death of Heracles, not, as she believed, the restoration of his love⁴.

Copyright © 1989 Douglas E Gerber

J.A.S. Evans (Pretoria): *The Consular Candidacy of C. Billienus*

LCM 14.7 (Jul.1989), 103-104

Item in iure et ante hos M. Brutus et paulo post eum C. Billienus homo per se magnus prope simili ratione summus euaserat; qui consul factus esset, nisi in Marianos consulatus et in eas petitionis angustias incidisset.

So says Cicero (*Brut.* 47.175) about a politician whom he evidently thought worthy of becoming consul, but who never did, on account of C.Marius' five successive consulships between 104 and 100 B.C. (Note with the variant spelling, Klebs, *RE* Bellienus no. 3; Henze, *RE* Bellienus no. 4.) It is not known when, or even if, he actually campaigned for the consulship, but there is certainly a chance that he undertook a canvass and that he failed in the polls. Is it possible to date this candidacy? I believe it is, and that a date is available.

Plutarch in his life of C.Marius (14.7) states that in the consular elections in 103, μετιόντων δὲ πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν τὴν ὑπατείαν. From these elections Marius and Q.Lutatius Catulus emerged the victors, but the identity of the other candidates remains unattested. Broughton (*MRR.* 1.551) assigns the praetorship of C.Billienus to 107 (cf. *MRR.*

as Bion's *Adonidis Epitaphium* 66 where Adonis' αἷμα ῥόδον τίκτει. This and a variant version which represents the rose as born of the blood of Aphrodite are not found before the late Hellenistic period and have no bearing on Bacchylides.

³ Roses are among the flowers being gathered by Persephone, in company with the Oceanids, when she was abducted (*Hom. Hymn to Demeter* 6ff.). For other examples see Richardson ad loc. and the references he cites, and for Aphrodite's association with the rose see Eleanor Irwin, 'The Crocus and the Rose: A Study of the Interrelationship between the Natural and the Divine World in Early Greek Poetry', *Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, ed. D.E. Gerber (Chico 1984) 147-68, esp. 161 ff..

⁴ The irony and ambiguity present in many of the epithets in this poem might well support the thesis of Jennifer March, *BICS* Suppl. 49 (1987) 62-66, that Bacchylides was influenced by Sophocles' *Trachiniae*.

1.553: 'pr. ca. 107-104'), which ties in rather well with a consular candidacy in 103. G.V.Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's 'Brutus': Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto, 1973, 105, suggested a birth-date for C. Billienus in 'ca. 147/6' or 'born not later than 143'. Moreover, a proconsular command, presumably as *praetorius*, is attested in the epigraphic evidence, and is dated to about this time (CIL I² 2.815: ΓΑΙΟΝ ΒΙΑΛΗΝΟΝ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΜΟΝ, *praetor pro consule*; cf. I² 3 Suppl. 1 7233; CIG 2285 B; I. de Délos 4. 1.1710).

The evidence, such as it is, supports the information implied in Cicero's *Brutus* that C. Billienus was praetor in the last decade of the first century B.C. and allows him ample opportunity for a consular campaign in 103. From Plutarch's evidence it is clear that there were several strong candidates in this year, which also suggests that Marius' re-election was not a foregone conclusion and that, like any other aspiring politician at Rome, he actually had to engage in rigorous campaigning to ensure success.

Unfortunately for C. Billienus, the citizen body voted C. Marius a fourth consulship and provided him with a colleague who had failed to be elected on three previous occasions (Cic. *pro Planc.* 5.12; *pro Mur.* 17.36). The electorate in this instance preferred a tried general and a familiar face to a relative unknown, however worthy he may have been.

Copyright © 1989 J.A.S. Evans

P.G. Naiditch (Dept. Special Collections, Research Library, *Augustan Manetho*
University of California, Los Angeles): LCM 14.7 (Jul.1989), 104-106

Athanasius Kircher, *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* 1, Rome 1652, pp. 68-69, quoting the Suda (M 143 Adler), writes: *Μανεθῶς ἐκ Διοσπόλεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἡ σεβεννύτης φυσιολογικά, ἀποτελεσματικά δι' ἐπῶν καὶ ἀλλὰ τίνα δοττρονομοῦμενα. Manethos ex Diospoli Aegypti scripsit physiologica apotelesmatica versibus, & alia quaedam astronomica. Huius monumenta in magni Ducis Hetruriae bibliotheca conseruari audio. atque hic est, qui temporibus Augusti vixit*¹. This passage raises two questions. Who told Kircher about Manetho's *Apotelesmatica*, and why was the work assigned to the time of Augustus? I think I can resolve the first problem.

Kircher's candour in this passage is not beyond reproach, and Edward Stillingfleet has commented upon it. 'Is it possible', he asks, disagreeably (*Origines Sacrae*, London 1662, pp. 53-54), 'so learned a *Jesuite* should discover so little judgment in so few words? for ... who ever asserted the *Writer* of the *Dynasties* to have lived in the time of Augustus?'; and then, more critically, he adds: 'But *Kircher* very wisely, in translating *Suidas* his words, leaves out *σεβεννύτης*, which decides the *controversie*, and makes it clear that he speaks of the same *Manetho* [sc. the author of the *Aegyptiaca*], of whom we have been discoursing'. Bentley's patron is right at least in this, that there was then reason to think the author of the *Apotelesmatica* identical with the writer of the *Aegyptiaca*. In addition, the first line of the first book of Manetho's *Apotelesmatica* is addressed to Ptolemy, apparently Ptolemy II Philadelphus².

¹ The titlepage is dated 1652, but on fol. ++3^v and c4, 1654 appears; and, on fol. ++^v and d2, 1655 is found. See also *Sylloges Epistolarum a Viris Illustribus Scriptarum* ed. P. Burmannus 5, Leyden 1727, p. 466 (1654).

² The author of the *Aegyptiaca* is assigned to the time of Ptolemy I or II. It may be noted in passing that the *Epistula Manethonis* (Georg. Syncell. chron. p. 73 D. = 41 M.) appears to belong, as Letronne once asserted without sufficient evidence, to the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century c.e.: the title *δεσπότης*, which is wrongly given to Philadelphus in the letter, seems to have been regularly employed in imperial Roman titlature only from the reign of Diocletian; the Roman title *σεβαστός*, also wrongly given him, ceases to be regularly used around 329 c.e.: the phrase *ἔρρωσό μοι*, with which the writer closes the letter, seems to be found only in the second and third and, occasionally, fourth centuries c.e. If then the letter is rightly associated with the *Book of Sothis*, then that work belongs to the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. The view that the two should be

No one can rightly consider the *Apotelesmatica* a popular treatise³. Even Josephus Scaliger, who 'seems to have read everything, Greek and Latin, published and unpublished, which could explain or illustrate [Manilius]', apparently never read him, and failed even to remember that Manetho was alleged to have composed the work⁴. Indeed, after the revival of learning in Western Europe, the first vague reference to the poem seems to be no earlier than the middle of the 16th century; and Konrad Gesner only says '*Manethonis Apotelesmaticus liber extat Graece, alicubi in Italia*'. (*Bibliotheca Vniuersalis*, Zurich 1545, f. 490^v = *Elenchus Scriptorum Omnium*, Basel 1551, c. 707).

It is chiefly because Manetho was little read that it may be possible to identify Kircher's source of information. Kircher himself does not pretend to have examined the *Apotelesmatica*: he has, he says, only heard that the work is preserved in the library of the Duke of Tuscany. Accordingly, we require for his source some student who fulfils four conditions: the student will need to be acquainted with Kircher, and he will have had to know that the manuscript of the *Apotelesmatica* was in Florence; he will need to have denied that the work had been composed as early as the first line implies, and his denial will have to antedate 1654. Arguably also it would be good if the student had himself examined the manuscript.

Only one scholar of the period seems to meet the requirements. It is true that Nicolaus Heinsius wrote J.F. Gronovius: *Inceperat ille [sc. L. Langermannus] Livio Mediceo manus admovere, jamque primae decadis libros duos absoluerat. Mox intermisit laborem, totus in Manethonis poetae Graeci Apotelesmatis describendis occupatus* (Oct. 28, 1652 Greg.: *Manetho* ed. 1698 fol. **2^{r-v}; *Sylloges* 3, Leyden 1727, pp. 302-3). It is also apparent that Heinsius wrote Isaac Vossius on the same subject, for Vossius replied: *Vellem videre specimen aliquod Manethonis, quem descripsisse ais nostrum Langermannum, de quo sane multum gaudeo, forsitan ex illo potest multum illustrari Manilius* (Nov. 24, 1652: *Sylloges* 3 p. 652). At least two of these scholars were known to Kircher. He corresponded with J.F. Gronovius (P. Dibon *et al.*, *Inventaire de la correspondance de Johannes Fredericus Gronovius*, La Haye 1974, p. 220) and was acquainted with Heinsius (cf. *Sylloges* 3 p. 176). But there is no evidence that Vossius,

associated may be additionally supported by the ignorant spelling *Maveθa*, where the so-called Attic genitive was confused with an indeclinable nominative. That spelling appears in Syncellus only in the letter and in the *Book of Sothis*. It is evidence of Syncellus's accuracy, or indolence, that when quoting from the *Book of Sothis*, Africanus or Eusebius, he uses a different spelling of Manetho's name; with regard to Eusebius, we know from the Armenian version that he reported the writer's preference accurately. It should therefore be practically certain that the *Book of Sothis* was not composed, as some maintain, by Panodorus at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century (cf. W.G. Waddell, *Manetho*, Loeb Classical Library 1940, p. 11 n. 2).

³ Cf. H. Lloyd-Jones in U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Baltimore 1982, p. 140 n. 521: 'we still use [Koechly's] Manetho of 1868, despite the useful Loeb edition by W.G. Waddell (1940)'. Waddell translated not the *Apotelesmatica* but the *Aegyptiaca*; the edition by Koechly to which Prof. Lloyd-Jones refers was published in 1858, not 1868. The *editio maior* was printed in *Poetae Bucolici et Didactici*, Paris 1851.

⁴ A.E. Housman, *M. Manilii astronomicon liber I*, London 1903, p. xiv. Housman's verb, 'seems', is precisely correct. But he himself should have known that Scaliger overlooked Manetho. Housman was drafting the preface to his first volume about the close of 1902 (cf. *The Letters of A.E. Housman* ed. H. Maas, London 1971, p. 63); his first reference to Manetho appears in June 1901 (cf. *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman* edd. Diggle/Goodyear, Cambridge 1972, p. 552). Manetho's name is scattered throughout his writings (*Manil.* I ad 30, 60, 262, 684-804: *Cl. Pap.* pp. 598-600; *Iuuen.* ad VI 0 2; *Cl. Pap.* pp. 740, 742-3, 745-6, 748-50, 810-2; *Manil.* II pp. vii, xxix, ad 231 etc.). It is clear that he made use not only of Axt and Rigler's edition, but one or the other or both of Koechly's (cf. *Cl. Pap.* p. 812 n. 1).

It was Jacobus Gronovius who first publicised Scaliger's oversight (*Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum libri sex*, Leyden 1698, fol. **1^v, referring to Scaliger, *M. Manili Astronomicon* 1, Leyden 1599, fol. 2-2^v, 2, Leyden 1600, p. 25). (So also in Scaliger's posthumous edition, Strassburg 1655, fol. *2^v, 3^v). Gronovius's implied criticism is not unjust, since Scaliger might have known Manetho's name from the *Suda* (e.g., *Suida*, Venice: Aldus, 1514, EE iii^r). Anna Comnena however, who has a passing reference to the work, did not appear in print until after Scaliger's death. Note: Housman's copy of Gronovius's *Manetho* survives, but it is not clear when he obtained the book (Trinity College, Cambridge, T 49.23). It is to Gronovius that I owe my first knowledge of most of the 17th century references to the *Apotelesmatica*.

Gronovius, Heinsius or, indeed, Langermannus thought the attribution to Ptolemy Philadelphus suspect, and Heinsius's report and Vossius's acknowledgment lead me to think that, at least to this time, Langermannus had not expressed any suspicions of its date⁵. Also relevant is the fact that, in the 16th and early 17th century, almost everyone who refers to the *Apotelesmatica* thinks it belongs to the Ptolemaic period: see D.T. Bartholinus, *De Medicis Poetis Dissertatio*, Copenhagen 1669, pp. 99-100 (cp. A. Magliabechi to L. Panciatichi, ca 1669, in *Raccolta di Prose Fiorentina* IV 2, Florence 1734, p. 23); Abraham Hinckelmann, *Detectione, Fundamenti Bohemiani*, Hamburg 1693, p. 114 (I have not seen this work, which I only know from a quotation in the Bodleian Library, Ms. d'Orville 595 ff. 46v-47r); Jac. Gronovius, *Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum Libri Sex*, Leyden 1698, fol. ***r-v; J.A. Fabricius, *Bibliothecae Graecae liber III*, Hamburg 1707, p. 499⁶. Therefore, at this time, a scholar who held the *Apotelesmatica* to be later than the Ptolemaic age held an unfashionable opinion. Such a scholar existed: Lucas Holstenius.

Lucas Holstenius was the first scholar to describe the manuscript of the *Apotelesmatica*. He wrote (*De Libris optimis ac maximam partem ineditis Bibliothecae Mediceae*, 1640): *Manethonis Poetae Aegyptii Apotelesmatica, carmine heroico scripta, ad nescio quem Ptolemaeum Aegypti Regem, nisi Auctor antiquitatem mentitur, quod ex stylo & numero conjicere non levi suspitione mihi videor* ([M. Lilienthal], *Selecta Historica et Literaria*, Leipzig 1715, p. 97; with variants or improvements, *Maneth.* ed. 1698 fol. **r). Holstenius was librarian of the Vatican when Kircher came to Rome, ca. 1635. Although no correspondence seems to be known⁷, Holstenius does refer to Kircher in his letters for 1636/1637 (cf. *Lucae Holstenii Epistolae ad Diversos* coll. J.F. Boissonade, Paris 1817, pp. 270-1, 275, 287, 495). That Holstenius should have been acquainted with Heinsius or with the others is irrelevant, since they show no suspicion of his date in the 1650s.

Holstenius therefore knew Kircher, and dwelling in the same city and both being men of rank, they should have had easy access to one another. He was familiar enough with the manuscript, and thought its author had feigned antiquity; and, apparently, he was for some time alone in this belief. This conclusion he reached long before Kircher's book went to press. Of the candidates known to me, then, Holstenius seems the most likely to have been Kircher's source. If then he were Kircher's source, we know the period to which he assigned Manetho's *Apotelesmatica*. Why he assigned it to the Augustan period is, however, another mystery.

Copyright © 1989 P.G.Naiditch

N. Postlethwaite (Leicester): μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν: *Odyssey* 11. 478

LCM 14.7 (Jul.1989), 106-108

When Odysseus encounters the ghost of Achilles in the Underworld during the first Nekyia he greets him in words which are fully formulaic:

ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ Πηληϊὸς υἱε, μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν

'Son of Peleus, Achilles, far greatest of the Achaians'.

⁵ The late date of their letters is not sufficient in itself to exclude them. One could argue that Kircher added the information only at the last minute, and consequently did not have time to visit Florence.

⁶ In the 18th century it was believed that the *Apotelesmatica* was later than the writer of the first book pretended. See J.-A. D'Orville (Bodl. Ms. D'Orville 408 f. 3^r); T. Tyrwhitt (*De Lapidibus*, London 1781, XII n. 9), who rightly separated the first and fifth books from the work and declared them later than the Hellenistic period; L. Valckenaer (University library, Cambridge, Adv. d 72.2, p.1); and L. Ziegler (as summarised by H. Koechly, *Maneth.* 1858, p. vi).

⁷ A plan to publish all of Kircher's works, including his letters, seems never to have been realised, though I was told by the late Jacob Zeitlin of Zeitlin & Ver Brugge Booksellers, Los Angeles, that a single volume was issued. My letter to the Edizioni del Mondo was never acknowledged.

In fact the line is unique in the *Odyssey* – which is hardly surprising in view of the rarity of Achilles' appearance – but it does occur twice in the *Iliad*. At 16. 21 Patroklos addresses Achilles thus when he returns to his tent with the request that he be permitted to return to the battle; and at 19. 216 Odysseus uses the same words to Achilles when he urges him to allow the army to eat and drink before confronting the Trojans to take vengeance for the death of Patroklos. The phrase μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν is formulaic by virtue of its repetition and also of its being assigned to Achilles on each occasion. It would however be a great mistake to dismiss it as 'merely' formulaic, since it may be shown to contribute to the understanding of both the *Iliad* and the Underworld scene in the *Odyssey*.

The struggle to be considered 'the best' is central to the lives of Homer's heroes (G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaians*, Baltimore 1979), and it is a struggle which lies at the heart of the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1. Nagy (27) considers *phertatos* to be a straight synonym of *aristos*, but the words of Nestor at *Iliad* 1. 279-281 suggest a further shade of meaning. In attempting to settle the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, Nestor gives his judgement thus:"

'Even though you are the stronger man, and the mother who bore you was immortal
yet is this man greater who is lord over more than you rule'.

Here Homer employs the comparative *pherteros*, and Nestor's meaning is clear: Agamemnon is superior to Achilles because he controls the greater forces, his military might counts for more than Achilles' warrior strength and divine parentage. This judgement lies very much at the heart of Achilles' decision to withdraw himself and his Myrmidons from the fighting, since it apparently confirms Agamemnon's own judgement:

'.. that you may learn well

how much greater I am than you'. (1. 185-186)

in which he too employs the comparative *pherteros*. It should be remembered that not one of the Achaians voices disagreement with Nestor's judgement. Of course *pherteros* is used of characters other than Agamemnon; Paris (*Iliad* 3. 431), Bellerophon (6. 158), Hektor (7. 105), Aias (17. 168), Zeus (4. 56, 8. 144 etc.), and Achilles himself (19. 217, 22. 40) all merit the title, but in none of these cases does the term bear the significance it is given in Book 1.

It is apparent then that there is a progression from Nestor's declaration in Book 1 that Agamemnon is the better, *pherteros*, to Odysseus' assertion – made directly to Achilles, using the vocative case – that Achilles is the best, *phertate*. The nominative *phertatos* is employed three times in the *Iliad*: of Zeus at 1. 581, spoken by Hephaistos; of Aias at 7. 289, though here with a second person verb 'with your spear you surpass the other Achaians' spoken by Hektor; and of Achilles himself at 2.769, in Homer's own words:

'Among the men far the best [*aristos*] was Telamonian Aias
while Achilles stayed angry, since he was far best of all of them'.

On only two occasions is the vocative employed in the *Iliad*: in both cases it is in the formula under consideration, and in both cases it is applied to Achilles, once by Patroklos and once by Odysseus. If we discount the Patroklos example on the grounds that he might be considered to be more than a little prejudiced in his estimation of Achilles' status amongst the Achaians, we are left with Odysseus' use of it at 19. 216 in his appeal to Achilles. Just as Nestor's declaration to Achilles in book 1, that Agamemnon was *pherteros*, was made in the presence of Agamemnon, and was not countered by any of the Achaians, so now Odysseus' declaration, that Achilles is *phertatos*, is likewise made within the hearing of Agamemnon, and it too goes unchallenged by the Achaian leadership. It is at least a possible conclusion that, as Nestor's judgement in book 1 marked the onset of Achilles' wrath against Agamemnon, so Odysseus' asseveration in book 19 – with the tacit agreement of all the other Achaians, including Agamemnon himself – of Achilles' status as *phertatos* is used by Homer to mark the resolution of that wrath. It is significant that Odysseus' declaration comes at the moment when the gifts of Agamemnon are once more in the foreground of the narrative. Just as in book 9 he refused to accept them, so now Achilles displays a total disregard for the gifts: the end of his dispute with Agamemnon is marked, not by gifts, but by the stated acknowledgement

of his superiority.

It seems hardly accidental that the one other use of the vocative formula, at *Odyssey* 11.478, should also be spoken to Achilles, and by Odysseus: and since immediately before conversing with the ghost of Achilles Odysseus was speaking with Agamemnon's ghost, and since Homer has not mentioned that ghost's departure in the meantime, it is a reasonable surmise that Odysseus also utters these words, just as in *Iliad* 19, in the presence of Agamemnon. At the very outset of the meeting between the hero of the *Iliad* and the hero of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus alludes to the dominant motif of the earlier poem, the dispute of Achilles and Agamemnon over status, with all its catastrophic consequences. There follows of course the momentous exchange between the two heroes, with Achilles' expressed preference for a life of anonymity over death and glory. By the use of a phrase which is 'merely' formulaic Homer conjures up the complex Iliadic background to an essentially Odyssean passage.

Copyright © 1989 N.Postlethwaite

Review: F. W. Walbank (Peterhouse, Cambridge) LCM 14.7 (Jul.1989), 108-112
Ramsay MacMullen, *Corruption and the Decline of Rome*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1988. Pp.xii + 319; 14 figs.. Cloth, \$18.95. ISBN 0-300-04313-9

1. 'On topics that deserve abiding interest, no one is likely to say the last word. One can only hope to influence the next book on the subject, by someone else, which will be better but still not quite right'. So ends the modest preface to this attractive and exciting book on Roman decline. That books on this subject continue to appear – each one not quite right – is partly because of its intrinsic interest, partly because it *ought* to provide us with some insight into our own problems (though the purist would no doubt angrily reject any such contamination of straight historical research) and partly because it is so difficult.

Difficult for several reasons. First, because the very word 'decline' is hard to define: how, for instance, are we to distinguish it from 'change'? Then again, with so vast a canvas it is not easy to distinguish causes from symptoms, the more so because the two often intermingle and interact. Finally there is the unsatisfactory character of our sources – the regular complaint of the ancient historian. On the one hand there is so little quantifiable material, yet, as MacMullen points out (pp.35-6), quantifiable material is perhaps the best means of tracing direction, up or down.

No less unsatisfactory are the constraints under which new evidence often becomes available. For example, data on wrecks may at first sight give us information about the apogee of sea-borne trade in the period 200 B.C. - A.D. 200, but on closer examination this impression will be modified when we realise that the wrecks 'lie at points dictated by ease of recent exploration and the delights of summer beaches' (p.9). Similarly, material that survives is bound to take precedence in our reconstructions over what has not survived; amphorae, for instance, over, say, barrels. And, turning to written sources, one must always allow for inaccurate statements, rhetoric and the anecdotal approach of some ancient historians – which can produce stories both true and false, significant or wholly insignificant. Ammianus, good though he can be, is a case in point, relevant to MacMullen's enquiry.

Despite these obstacles, a certain degree of agreement seemed to have been reached on some issues, especially in the widely accepted view that one has to look for a combination of factors both to define 'decline and fall' and to explain it. With the first of these assumptions MacMullen is in agreement. His purpose is 'to show how complicated and far from monolithic the Empire and its "decline" really were'. But, as to the second – the causes – he prefers to revert to a single explanation, interpreting 'decline' in terms primarily of the failure of the Roman power-system and then setting out what he regards as the main – indeed I think one can fairly say the sole – cause of that failure.

2 The book consists of four chapters and three appendices. Of the latter, the first gives a list of barbarians occupying special positions during the fourth century, the second discusses 'leading

figures' who can be detected exercising power independently of government and offices, and the third provides a representative catalogue of soldiers stationed in towns and cities. All these are of direct relevance to the on-going argument set out in the four chapters.

Chapter One is devoted to finding a definition of decline which will provide an adequate field to investigate. After conceding the perhaps obvious point that decline sets in at different times in different spheres, MacMullen concentrates on the paralysis of curial activity in the towns and on the manifest deterioration in security, which left the peoples of the Empire with little defence against enemies without and outrage within and made it virtually impossible for what we understand by civilisation to flourish.

The second chapter analyses the nature and distribution of power in the Roman state. Security in any society rests on the stability of its structure and that in turn on the location of power within it. Some societies depend on a heavy governmental apparatus; but at Rome, down to the late Empire, officials were remarkably few in numbers. Consequently, as a regular feature of their everyday lives, people fell back to a large degree on private help and the back-up provided by a series of relationships linking rich and poor, patrons and clients, landlords and tenants, masters and slaves or freedmen, in which each individual had his appropriate place and knew in general what was expected of him and what he could claim in return. Words like *fides* and *obsequium* gave an acceptable colouring to relationships in which one man's rank relative to another's was often asserted with arrogance, brutality and contempt and social status was maintained by instilling fear or exercising favour. The link between this network of claims and obligations and the official representatives of government was provided by powerful individuals, who throughout Roman history exerted great influence irrespective of whether they were in office or not.

MacMullen represents this system of social relations as something which penetrated the whole of Roman public and private life. Its breakdown is the subject of Chapter Three, for it was that, in his opinion, which led to decline in all spheres of life. The cause of that breakdown was, it seems, the growth in power and numbers of a bureaucracy which no longer identified with the people and was concerned only with its own profit. The norms of behaviour to which this inflated bureaucracy subscribed were those that had previously existed in the lower ranks – 'slaves, freedmen, supply sergeants and petty accountants' is MacMullen's phrase – in short, the personnel of the *decuriae*, who habitually accepted the small bribes, which were generally tolerated in 'a genial, oily, present-giving world' (p.126). It was, as Wolfgang Schuller had argued (p.169), the spread upwards of these slavish norms of behaviour into the higher ranks of the civil service, the army and even, later, the church, that produced the decisive change, that is, which (though MacMullen makes no reference to the Marxist formulation) was first quantitative and then, at a certain point, became qualitative – with lethal consequences. The larger bureaucracy spawned by the tetrarchy (MacMullen gives some figures relevant to its growth on p.144) became increasingly and devastatingly corrupt. Everything was now up for bids; every transaction involved a *concussio* – the literal equivalent, says MacMullen (p.157) of the 'English' 'shake-down' (cf. *Shorter English Dictionary*, 'shake-down', U.S. an exaction, 1903). Alongside this we find a growth of cruelty and anti-intellectualism, signs of the alienation of those in power from the rest of the population.

The alleged results of this process are dealt with in Chapter Four, which MacMullen entitles 'the price of privatisation', a loaded phrase evidently chosen for its specific contemporary resonances (cf. p.281 n.86). Briefly, the centre does not hold; and, adapting a formula borrowed from Tsarist Russia, MacMullen claims that the later Empire was not, as is often said, an autocracy, but a state run chaotically by 10,000 clerks. One's job – one's *militia*, if one is anywhere in the public service – is something bought as a private investment to be exploited thereafter for private gain; and the army itself is fragmented, domesticated, diminished and barbarised (for numbers see p.101 n.68) Hence, from the mid-fourth century provinces begin to drop away, foreshadowing the eventual disintegration of the Western Empire. At the root lies corruption. Finally, MacMullen illustrates this process from various incidents, many related by Ammianus, which he describes (but without the usual sneer at *histoire événementielle*) as

'schoolboy history'.

3. MacMullen's book is impressive for its clear exposition of his case and for its well-documented argument: but it leaves the reader with several doubts and queries.

On p.36 MacMullen quotes with approval Baynes's dictum that any explanation of the decline of the Western Empire must face and account for the survival of the Eastern Empire down to 1453. I am not sure that MacMullen has done this. Indeed, by ending his discussion with the break-in of the barbarians in the fifth century, he almost inevitably side-steps that problem. True, he draws attention to the underlying economic weakness of the western provinces compared with those of the east: the cities of the north and west (p.48) had suffered from internal haemorrhage, with the depression of the curial class, and such prosperity as they showed depended almost exclusively on the presence of the Emperor and his court, or, at least, on that of his official representatives – though the striking examples of curial failure quoted are in fact from the east, from Antioch and Egypt. For the north and west, which bore the brunt of barbarian invasion, it was apparently the combination of this internal wound with inadequate army defences which brought about the collapse. But the corruption which MacMullen sees as the destructive force in the army was presumably equally rife in the east: so that if that was the root of the trouble, the survival of the east is a little puzzling.

MacMullen's argument presupposes a moral change in the community with the spread of a wholly self-regarding ethic upwards from the slavish *decuriae* to infect the whole army and bureaucracy. It would be hard to challenge his documentation of the fact that the fourth and fifth centuries saw an increase in corruption and insecurity and some change in the norms of behaviour in the army and civil service. The question is, however, – and this MacMullen concedes – just how decisive this change was. In fact, most of the practices he mentions can be paralleled from much earlier times and not only in the lower 'slave-derived' classes. One need only think of Verres under the Republic (p.133) or Marius Priscus, who suffered a very nominal punishment (according to Juvenal), despite his having accepted bribes to execute Roman citizens most savagely (Pliny, *ep.* 2.11); or even Cicero's kid-gloved response to the depredations of M.Brutus in his province. The power of the *potentiores*, exploited both through and independently of officials to their own advantage, is a recurring component of the social system throughout Roman history and MacMullen himself compares it (p.107) with the Mafia organisation in modern Sicily. Office was expected to bring benefits to oneself, one's friends and one's clients (as under the party system in the U.S.A. where a change of the party in power used to bring about changes in the tenure of even sub-clerical posts). At Rome the integrity of an exceptional commander like Aemilius Paulus earns the wonder of the Greek historian (Polyb.31.22); and it was commonly supposed that a provincial governor would amass enough to pay off his electioneering debts and set himself up for the future. It is therefore perhaps somewhat unrealistic to claim that hitherto judges had taken bribes 'only through lower intermediaries' (p.167). Was that so of Marius Priscus.

The question is, of course, one of degree – as MacMullen insists. If there were such scandals earlier, were they regarded as exceptional, or were they merely accepted as 'the way things are'? Clearly behaviour like that of Verres aroused indignation (though what we hear is of course the voice of prosecuting counsel). But there was usually a closing of ranks, some display of 'understanding' and frequently an element of compromise when a member of one's own group was concerned and the accusers were provincials. It seems wrong, therefore, to speak of 'corruption' as something originally peculiar to the lower classes. In one form or another, it was to be found in all ranks as a concomitant of the social structure which MacMullen has so excellently described. If there had once been a golden age of integrity, it had already gone by the time Polybius was writing in the later second century B.C. (cf. Polyb.3.35, modifying the opinions expressed earlier in 6.56). The system of favour, bribes and 'shake-downs' was already there at an early date and was so widespread that to term it 'corruption' is rather misleading. The examples are there in MacMullen's text: the distribution of military posts through favour at the time of Pliny (pp.101 and 132); bribery in the courts, for which there is evidence in Propertius, Petronius, Tacitus and Apuleius (pp.133-4), though it is played down by MacMullen as rhetorical

or as evidence that there still existed 'a sense of right opposed to wrong'; the general reputation of the *publicani*, 'synonymous with sinners' (p.150); and *skepé*, endemic in the east (p.130). True, it is only later that the laws accept the implications of the system by referring to exactions which are *ultra modum* or *ultra statutum*, and that could be taken to indicate a change in attitude. But what I think MacMullen has not demonstrated is that any such change was substantial and even less that it was historically significant in the sense that it caused the collapse of security and the subsequent decline.

That there was a collapse and failure of efficiency in the armies of the late Empire, which no longer proved capable of protecting at any rate the northern and western provinces, is of course a truism. Weakness of defence is at the heart of the problem (p.191). But many of the obvious deficiencies of the armies are patently not linked to 'corruption' at all; nor, as MacMullen admits (p.177), do our sources ever link the two, not even the sources most critical (and justly critical) of the performance of the armies (for the evidence cf. p.15 n.15). Ammianus, it is true, often pin-points poor performance in individuals responsible for disasters and even the loss of provinces, and for the collapse of discipline and neglect of orders; but it is only by 'the logic of the situation' that MacMullen can connect these with corrupt practices. He may indeed be right in doing so; but the silence of the sources on this point is not to be ignored. One practice, which must surely rank as no less important a cause of army inefficiency than corruption, is the use made of barbarian troops. This had of course begun with auxiliaries under the Republic and was wholly understandable in the conditions both of the Republic and of the early Empire, when the recruitment area shifted from the more civilised parts to the lower Danube (pp.533-4), whose inhabitants still had many of the characteristics of the barbarian world, including an eagerness to fight. The domestication and civilianising of the army (which MacMullen has analysed vividly in others of his writings) may have proved an error, but they were a natural outcome of long periods of relative security. The infiltration of barbarians into the Empire could also be defended at the time as a sensible solution to internal problems of depopulation and as a means of keeping the barbarians themselves under surveillance. In all of these developments, most of them (with hindsight) disastrous, corruption plays no part.

In concentrating on corruption MacMullen may have understated the importance of other defects, not directly affecting the army, but certainly relevant to the decline of the western Empire. To mention just one, there is the question of the technological level within the Empire; for here, it seems to me, MacMullen adopts too static a point of view. On p.xi, describing how he came to the problem of decline, he formulates the question as one of how 'a given quantity of people with a given quantity of raw materials and inhabiting a given terrain that did not much change' were at one time able to conquer their external enemies and at another collapsed before their attacks. But none of the three factors he names are 'given' in the sense of remaining the same. All three change over the centuries and how they change and the results of such change are likely to form part of the problem. Insecurity can arise if resources of various kinds cease to be available. MacMullen himself attributes the fragmentation of the later army to cheese-paring (p.176): it was cheaper to have troops nearer to their sources of supplies, no matter what other consequences followed from that step. Cheese-paring may be a response to shortage due to corrupt practices: but not necessarily. Defence puts a heavy financial strain on any economy, even one administered with integrity, and a weak economy means weak defences. As pressure on the frontiers grew greater, inability to use improved technology to increase production may be a factor at least as relevant as corruption in explaining military weakness. There was of course a steady trickle of technological advances in the Roman world; but there is no indication that those in control saw technological improvement as useful and desirable. As MacMullen points out (p.18), one may wonder 'whether the employer class and particularly those within it who controlled the most wealth and could best make their views prevail really appreciated the economic possibilities in industrial technology or whether, in agriculture, they attached as much value to invention as to management'.

Here we are talking, not of economics, but of mental attitudes and norms of behaviour (just as we are when we talk of corruption). The importance of slavery as a factor in the decline of

Rome has been exaggerated (not least in my own *The Awful Revolution* (1969), MacMullen rightly rejects the theory that a fall in the number of slaves was significant for the decline of Rome. Slavery was in fact only one way of extracting wealth from the labours of others and one of small consequence in many parts of the Empire such as Egypt and Asia Minor, where free labour or something like serfdom was more prevalent. But perhaps more important than the direct economic effect of either the existence of slavery or the drying-up of the main source of slaves is the mental atmosphere which slavery created. When pressure grew, the enormous gap both in wealth and in attitudes of mind between those who owned the land and workshops and those who laboured made it unlikely that the rich would exercise their ingenuity to invent labour-saving devices in preference to controlling and pressurising their workers, or that the poor would have either the opportunity or the incentive to think up something so apparently irrelevant to their daily drudgery. This is an area in which positive evidence is hard to locate but one might expect some connection to have existed between a rather static level of technology under slavery and failure to respond to increased pressure on resources and increased financial demands. Against his hypothesis MacMullen quotes the appearance of a series of improved weaves, which were developed in the near East in the third century A.D. 'during the supposed decline of slavery'. I find the argument at this point rather hard to follow, but in any case I very much doubt whether a single example of what MacMullen (p.18) calls 'a labour-intensive process' is enough to exclude the possibility of a link between slavery and lack of inventiveness generally.

Another possible 'cause' of decline to which MacMullen attributes some subsidiary importance is the lack of commitment to Rome, of patriotism, one might say; and this also is likely to be the result of a dispiritingly low level of personal satisfaction rather than of corruption. Moreover the growing approximation of the mass of the people to what were formerly slave conditions of life, with restricted freedom at law (however much such regulations were evaded) and with hideous punishments inflicted on *humiliores*, must have made them less and less inclined to regard Rome as something worth fighting for. Briefly, corruption undoubtedly played its part in the ruin of the western Empire, but it cannot be given the exclusive pre-eminence that MacMullen accords it.

4. This is an impressive book, full of illuminating material and acute observations, to which one will return repeatedly for information on a variety of topics – on taxation, for example, on the morale and conditions within the decurionate, on the maintenance of *dignitas* by the meting out of insulting behaviour and its necessary acceptance by those lower down the ladder (p.70), on the recipe for successful revolt in the later Empire (p.112) and much more. I noted few errors. Fergus Millar's *The Emperor in the Roman World*, though quoted (naturally), has slipped out of the bibliography; on p.89 for 'persecution' read 'prosecution'; and on p.128, in a discussion of the situation depicted in Pliny, *ep.*1.7, which concerns what action Pliny should take in the case brought by his clients in Baetica against X, a protégé of his correspondent, whereas MacMullen says that 'he can only promise not to take on the *accused* as his own client', surely the concession which Pliny made to the claims of friendship was not to give active support to his own Baetican clients. The explicit reference to Irangate and other Washington scandals on p.197 shows the author alert to echoes of the ancient world in the contemporary American scene. 'Is that now our settled habit, our *consuetudo*, the start of our decline?' he asks (still harping on corruption), and replies 'No. But who can observe the will of a great empire dissolving in the uncontrolled impulses of private enterprise – of *mercatores* and *kapeloi*, as our fourth-century commentators call them – without wondering if there may not be some lesson there?' Here too, in England, one is tempted to echo 'Who, indeed?'